

Quantum Data Processing

Rudolf Ahlswede and Peter Löber

Abstract

We prove a data processing inequality for quantum communication channels, which states that processing a received quantum state may never increase the mutual information between input and output states.

I. INTRODUCTION

Our starting point was the question whether Holevo's upper bound could be viewed as a special case of a more general theorem, the quantum data processing inequality (that should hold). An inequality of this kind states for an information transfer via (quantum) communication channels that if a received state is "processed", this may never increase the mutual information between input and output states.

We soon realized that a quantum data processing inequality is a corollary of Uhlmann's Monotonicity Theorem (see Sec. 5) which is a generalization of a theorem of Lieb ([7]). Like in the proof of the classical data processing inequality (which plays around with conditional mutual information¹), convexity properties play a central role. Here, we will need such properties "for operators" (see Sec. 3).

II. PICK FUNCTIONS

This section introduces the notion of Pick functions. We will see in the next section that Pick functions are "operator monotone" (cf. Cor. 3.4 for a rigorous formulation), a fact that is very useful because often it's quite easy to decide whether a function is a Pick function or not. The theory we introduce here is developed in great detail (and with complete proofs) in [4].

Definition 2.1: $H^\pm \triangleq \{x + iy \in \mathbb{C} | y \gtrless 0\}$ denote the two half spaces, respectively. $P \triangleq \{\varphi: H^+ \rightarrow H^+ \text{ analytic} \}$ denotes the set of *Pick functions*.

Remark 2.2: P is a convex cone, and if $f, g \in P$ then $g \circ f \in P$, too.

Example 2.3: The function $\varphi(z) \triangleq z^\mu$ with $0 < \mu \leq 1$ is in P . A function $\psi(z) \triangleq \alpha z + \beta + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\gamma_i}{\delta_i - z}$ with $\alpha, \gamma_i > 0$ and $\beta, \delta_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is in P , too.

The next theorem shows that the latter examples give essentially (i.e. up to limits) all Pick functions:

Theorem 2.4: Every Pick function $\varphi \in P$ has a (unique) representation

$$\varphi(z) \triangleq \alpha z + \beta + \int \left(\frac{1}{x - z} - \frac{x}{x^2 + 1} \right) d\mu(x) \quad (1)$$

with $\alpha \geq 0$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and μ a positive Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}$ for which $\int (x^2 + 1)^{-1} d\mu(x) < \infty$.

The authors are with Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Bielefeld, Postfach 100131, 33501 Bielefeld.
E-mail: ahlswede@mathematik.uni-bielefeld.de, loeber@mathematik.uni-bielefeld.de

¹cf. [2], p. 55 or [1], p. 32

This theorem is from [4], p. 20 ff. Its proof transforms the Pick function with an appropriate Möbius transformation (and its inverse) to a function which maps the unit disc into itself and which has a positive real part. This real part is a positive harmonic function.

Definition 2.5: For an open interval $(a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ let $\mathbb{C}(a, b) \triangleq H^+ \cup H^- \cup (a, b)$ and

$$P(a, b) \triangleq \{\varphi: \mathbb{C}(a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} : \varphi|_{H^+} \in P \wedge \varphi(\bar{\cdot}) = \overline{\varphi(\cdot)}\}.$$

Remark 2.6: $P(a, b)$ is a convex cone. Moreover, $\varphi \in P(a, b)$ implies that $\varphi|_{(a, b)}$ is a monotonically increasing real function. (As ϕ maps H^+ into H^+ and H^- into H^- it has to be real on the real axis. Let now $\varphi = u + iv$ and $z = x + iy$. By definition $\frac{d}{dy}v(x) \geq 0$, and the Cauchy-Riemann differential equations imply that $\frac{d}{dx}u(x) \geq 0$, too.)

Example 2.7: The function $\varphi(z) \triangleq z^\mu$ with $0 < \mu \leq 1$ is in $P(0, \infty)$. A function $\psi(z) \triangleq \alpha z + \beta + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\gamma_i}{\delta_i - z}$ with $\alpha, \gamma_i > 0$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta_i \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (a, b)$ is in $P(a, b)$, too.

Remark 2.8: Let $\varphi \in P$ a Pick function and μ its corresponding Borel measure (cf. (1)). Let $(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}$ an interval. Then:

$$\varphi \in P(a, b) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mu((a, b)) = 0.$$

This remark is again from [4] (p. 26), like the next example (p. 27):

$$\text{Example 2.9: } \sqrt{z} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(\frac{1}{x-z} - \frac{x}{x^2+1} \right) \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\pi} dx$$

III. OPERATOR MONOTONICITY

The first part of this section introduces the notion of operator monotonicity. The results are taken from [4], pp. 67ff. We show that Pick functions are operator monotone.

In the sequel we consider operator convexity properties like it was done in [5], pp. 230ff. It will be important for the next sections that root functions are operator concave (cf. Example 3.9). Here, all Hilbert spaces (usually denoted by $\mathcal{H}$, etc.) are supposed to be finite dimensional.

Definition 3.1: Let $\mathcal{H}$ a finite dimensional (complex) Hilbert space.

- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the algebra of linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$.
- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^{s.a.}$ denotes the real vector space of self-adjoint operators on $\mathcal{H}$.
- An operator $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is called *positive* if $\langle v | Av \rangle \geq 0 \ \forall v \in \mathcal{H}$.
- $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^+$ denotes the convex cone of positive operators on $\mathcal{H}$. (It holds $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^+ \subset \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^{s.a.}$.)
- For operators $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ we write $A \leq B$ if $B - A$ is positive.

Definition 3.2: Let $\mathcal{H}$ a finite dimensional (complex) Hilbert space, $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ an interval, $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a function, and $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^{s.a.}$ with all its eigenvalues in I .

- For $A = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i |a_i\rangle\langle a_i|$, where $(|a_i\rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ denotes an ON basis of $\mathcal{H}$, we define $f(A) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n f(a_i) |a_i\rangle\langle a_i|$. (Clearly, this is independent of the chosen basis.) In matrix

notation we have

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & a_n \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{f} f(A) = \begin{pmatrix} f(a_1) & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & f(a_n) \end{pmatrix}.$$

- f is called *operator monotone of order n* (“ $f \in P_n(I)$ ”) if

$$B \leq C \implies f(B) \leq f(C) \quad \forall B, C \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^{s.a.}.$$

- f is called *operator monotone* if $f \in P_n(I) \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 3.3: • $P_n(I)$ is a convex cone.

- If $f \in P_n(I)$, $g \in P_n(J)$ with $\text{im}(f) \subseteq J$ then $g \circ f \in P_n(I)$.
- $P_n(I)$ is closed (in the topology of pointwise convergence).
- $P_{n+1}(I) \subseteq P_n(I)$.
- For $\alpha > 0$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $x \mapsto \alpha x + \beta$ is operator monotone.
- $x \mapsto -\frac{1}{x}$ is operator monotone on $(0, \infty)$.

Proof: All assertions but the last one are obvious.

So, for $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^+$ strictly positive (0 is no eigenvalue) and $v, w \in \mathcal{H}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle v|w \rangle|^2 &= |\langle A^{-\frac{1}{2}}v|A^{\frac{1}{2}}w \rangle|^2 \leq \langle A^{-\frac{1}{2}}v|A^{-\frac{1}{2}}v \rangle \langle A^{\frac{1}{2}}w|A^{\frac{1}{2}}w \rangle \\ &= \langle v|A^{-1}v \rangle \langle w|Aw \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

with equality (e.g.) for $w = A^{-1}v$. (This is Cauchy-Schwarz-Buniakowski Inequality!)
Therefore:

$$\langle v|A^{-1}v \rangle = \max_{w \neq 0} \frac{|\langle v|w \rangle|^2}{\langle w|Aw \rangle},$$

and this immediately implies that for $B, C \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^{s.a.}$:

$$B \leq C \iff B^{-1} \geq C^{-1} \iff -B^{-1} \leq -C^{-1}.$$

■

Corollary 3.4: Let $\varphi \in P(a, b)$. Then, $\varphi|_{(a,b)}$ is operator monotone.

Example 3.5: $f(x) \triangleq x^\mu$ with $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$ is operator monotone.

This is not (!) true if $\mu > 1$. For (e.g.) $\mu = 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} 3.1 & 0 \\ 0 & 3.1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{but} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}^2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 10 & 6 \\ 6 & 10 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 3.1 & 0 \\ 0 & 3.1 \end{pmatrix}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 9.61 & 0 \\ 0 & 9.61 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.6: Let $f \geq 0$ a continuous and operator monotone function on $[0, \infty)$, and let $x \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^+$ and $a \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ with $\|a\|_{op} \leq 1$. Then:

$$f(a^*xa) \geq a^*f(x)a. \quad (2)$$

Proof: Let $b \triangleq (\mathbf{1} - aa^*)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $c \triangleq (\mathbf{1} - a^*a)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and define operators

$$X \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & -a^* \end{pmatrix}$$

on $\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}$. Given now $\varepsilon > 0$ let λ large enough such that:

$$Y \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} a^*xa + \varepsilon \mathbf{1} & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix} \geq \begin{pmatrix} a^*xa & a^*xb \\ bxa & bxb \end{pmatrix} = U^*XU.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow f(Y) &\geq F(U^*XU) = U^*f(X)U \geq U^* \begin{pmatrix} f(x) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} U = \begin{pmatrix} a^*f(x)a & a^*f(x)b \\ bf(x)a & bf(x)b \end{pmatrix} \\ \Rightarrow a^*f(x)a &\leq f(a^*xa + \varepsilon \mathbf{1}) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} f(a^*xa) \end{aligned}$$

■

Remark 3.7: We call functions f that fulfill (2) *operator concave*. Indeed, a non-negative continuous function on $[0, \infty)$ that is operator concave is also operator monotone (cf. [5], p. 232). Furthermore, operator concave functions f fulfill *Jensen's Inequality*:

$\forall x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^+$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ with $\sum_i a_i^*a_i \leq \mathbf{1}$ it holds: $f(\sum_i a_i^*x_ia_i) \geq \sum_i a_i^*f(x_i)a_i$.

Proof:

$$X \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & x_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad A \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ \vdots \\ a_n \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow A^*XA = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_i a_i^*x_ia_i & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & & & \\ \vdots & & 0 & \\ 0 & & & \end{pmatrix}$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{pmatrix} f(\sum_i a_i^*x_ia_i) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & & & \\ \vdots & & 0 & \\ 0 & & & \end{pmatrix} = f(A^*XA) \underset{(2)}{\geq} A^*f(X)A = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_i a_i^*f(x_i)a_i & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & & & \\ \vdots & & 0 & \\ 0 & & & \end{pmatrix}$$

■

Corollary 3.8: Let $f \geq 0$ a continuous and operator monotone function on $[0, \infty)$, and let $x \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^+$ and $a: \mathcal{H}' \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ a (lin.) contraction ($\|a\|_{op} \leq 1$). It holds: $f(a^*xa) \geq a^*f(x)a$.

Example 3.9: For $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$ we have $(a^*xa)^\mu \geq a^*x^\mu a$ (with notation from Cor. 3.8).

IV. FINITE QUANTUM SYSTEMS AND PHYSICAL MAPS

In this section we introduce the notion of finite quantum systems and the maps of such systems that are considered to be in accordance with quantum physics' laws.

Definition 4.1: A *finite quantum system* $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite dimensional C^* -algebra, i.e. a self-adjoint subalgebra (with identity) of some $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, where $\dim(\mathcal{H}) < \infty$.

A *physical state* (on this system) is an element $A \in \mathcal{A}^+ \triangleq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})^+ \cap \mathcal{A}$ for which $\text{tr}(A) = 1$.

Remark 4.2: Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ and A a physical state on $\mathcal{A}$. Then $A = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & a_n \end{pmatrix}$

for an ONB of A -eigenvectors (by abuse of notation), and A may be interpreted as a probability distribution on these basis vectors.

Definition 4.3: A $\mathbb{C}$ -linear map $\alpha_*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is *positive* if $\alpha_*(\mathcal{A}^+) \subseteq \mathcal{B}^+$. It is called *completely positive* if all maps of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_* \otimes \mathbf{1}: \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{C} &\rightarrow \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{C} \\ \sum_i a_i \otimes c_i &\mapsto \alpha_*(a_i) \otimes c_i \end{aligned}$$

are positive. A *physical map* of finite quantum systems $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$ is a trace preserving and completely positive $\mathbb{C}$ -linear map $\alpha_*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$.

Fortunately, the completely positive maps have a nice representation by Stinespring's Theorem (see [3], p. 137 or [9] for a proof):

Theorem 4.4: Let $\alpha_*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ a completely positive map of finite quantum systems. Then

$$\alpha_*(A) = V^* \rho(A) V \quad (\forall A \in \mathcal{A})$$

for some representation ρ of $\mathcal{A}$ on a finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ and a linear map $V: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$. Here, the representation ρ is an (algebra-)homomorphism with $\rho(A^*) = \rho(A)^*$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, and $\rho(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}$.

Remark 4.5: A *physical map* $\alpha_*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ maps physical states on $\mathcal{A}$ on physical states on $\mathcal{B}$. There are 3 equivalent ways to describe a physical map of finite (!) quantum systems:

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & \alpha_*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \\ & A \mapsto \alpha_*(A) \\ (2) \quad & \alpha: \mathcal{A}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^* \\ & \text{tr}_{\mathcal{A}}(A \cdot) \mapsto \text{tr}_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha_*(A) \cdot) \\ (3) \quad & \alpha^*: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \\ & \dots \text{ such that } \alpha(\lambda) = \lambda \circ \alpha^*. \end{aligned}$$

A $\mathbb{C}$ -linear map $\alpha_*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is a physical map if α^* is completely positive and unity preserving. This implies that $\beta \triangleq \alpha^*$ is a *Schwarz map*, i.e. $\beta(x^*x) \geq \beta(x)^* \beta(x) \ \forall x \in \mathcal{B}$. (This can be deduced from Stinespring's Theorem.)

If $A \in \mathcal{A}^+$ is a physical state we call $\text{tr}(A \cdot) \in \mathcal{A}^*$ a *physical state*, too.

V. UHLMANN'S MONOTONICITY THEOREM

Uhlmann's Monotonicity Theorem is our key tool to prove the quantum version of a data processing inequality. Its proof (the proof of the following lemma) uses the operator concavity of the root functions (see Ex. 3.9). For this section we closely followed [8], p. 18 ff.

Lemma 5.1: Let $\beta = \alpha^*: \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ a physical map of finite quantum systems, $S_1, T_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1^+$ and $S_2, T_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2^+$ with the T_i invertible ($i = 1, 2$). If for all $a \in \mathcal{A}_1^+$ it holds

$$\text{tr}(S_2\beta(a)) \leq \text{tr}(S_1a) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{tr}(T_2\beta(a)) \leq \text{tr}(T_1a),$$

then

$$\text{tr}(\beta(x)^* S_2^t \beta(x) T_2^{1-t}) \leq \text{tr}(x^* S_1^t x T_1^{1-t}) \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq 1, x \in \mathcal{A}_1.$$

Example 5.2: $\text{tr}(S_2^t T_2^{1-t}) \leq \text{tr}(S_1^t T_1^{1-t}).$

Proof: We remark that $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are Hilbert spaces with inner product $\langle a, b \rangle = \text{tr}(a^*b)$.

Define a linear map $V: \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ by $aT_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \mapsto \beta(a)T_2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}_1$.

V is a contraction, in fact:

$$\|\beta(a)T_2^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 = \text{tr}(T_2\beta(a)^*\beta(a)) \leq \text{tr}(T_2\beta(a^*a)) \leq \text{tr}(T_1a^*a) = \|aT_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2.$$

For $i = 1, 2$ define $\Delta_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_i)^+$ by $\Delta_i(aT_i^{\frac{1}{2}}) \triangleq S_i a T_i^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}_i$.

(It is positive because $\langle aT_i^{\frac{1}{2}} | \Delta_i | aT_i^{\frac{1}{2}} \rangle = \langle aT_i^{\frac{1}{2}} | S_i a T_i^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rangle = \text{tr}(T_i^{\frac{1}{2}} a^* S_i a T_i^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = \text{tr}(a^* S_i a) \geq 0$.)

It holds $\Delta_i^t(aT_i^{\frac{1}{2}}) = S_i^t a T_i^{\frac{1}{2}-t}$ ($t \geq 0$), and $V^* \Delta_2 V \leq \Delta_1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle aT_1^{\frac{1}{2}} | V^* \Delta_2 V | aT_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \rangle &= \langle \beta(a)T_2^{\frac{1}{2}} | \Delta_2 | \beta(a)T_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \rangle = \langle \beta(a)T_2^{\frac{1}{2}} | S_2 \beta(a)T_2^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rangle \\ &= \text{tr}(\beta(a)^* S_2 \beta(a)) \leq \text{tr}(S_2 \beta(a \alpha^*)) \leq \text{tr}(S_1 \alpha \alpha^*) = \langle aT_1^{\frac{1}{2}} | \Delta_1 | aT_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

So², $V^* \Delta_2^t V \leq (V^* \Delta_2 V)^t \leq \Delta_1^t$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(T_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta(x)^* S_2^t \beta(x) T_2^{\frac{1}{2}-t}) &= \langle xT_1^{\frac{1}{2}} | V^* \Delta_2^t V | xT_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \rangle \\ &\leq \langle xT_1^{\frac{1}{2}} | \Delta_1^t | xT_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \rangle = \text{tr}(T_1^{\frac{1}{2}} x^* S_1^t x T_1^{\frac{1}{2}-t}). \end{aligned}$$

■

Definition 5.3: Given a physical state $A \in \mathcal{A}^+$ we denote in the sequel its *support*, i.e. the projector on the space spanned by the eigenvectors corresponding to non-zero eigenvalues, by *supp* A .

Two physical states $A, B \in \mathcal{A}^+$ have *divergence*

$$D(A||B) \triangleq \begin{cases} \text{tr}(A(\log A - \log B)), & \text{if } \text{supp } A \leq \text{supp } B \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Equivalently, physical states $\omega = \text{tr}(A \cdot), \varphi = \text{tr}(B \cdot) \in \mathcal{A}^*$ have *divergence* $D(\omega||\varphi) \triangleq D(A||B)$. Sometimes, divergence is called *relative entropy*, too.

We are ready for Uhlmann's Monotonicity Theorem ([10]):

²We use Ex. 3.9 (like we promised above).

Theorem 5.4: Let $\beta = \alpha^*: \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ a physical map of finite quantum systems and $\omega, \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_2^*$ physical states. Then:

$$D(\omega \circ \beta || \varphi \circ \beta) \leq D(\omega || \varphi) .$$

Proof: Let $\omega = \text{tr}(S_2 \cdot)$, $\varphi = \text{tr}(T_2 \cdot)$, $\omega \circ \beta = \text{tr}(S_1 \cdot)$ and $\varphi \circ \beta = \text{tr}(T_1 \cdot)$, where w.l.o.g. $\text{supp } T_2 = \mathbf{1}$. As $\text{tr}(S_2 \beta(\cdot)) = \omega \circ \beta = \text{tr}(S_1 \cdot)$ and $\text{tr}(T_2 \beta(\cdot)) = \varphi \circ \beta = \text{tr}(T_1 \cdot)$ Lemma 5.1 implies that:

$$\text{tr}(S_2^\mu T_2^{1-\mu}) \leq \text{tr}(S_1^\mu T_1^{1-\mu}) \quad (\forall 0 \leq \mu \leq 1).$$

Consequently, $\frac{1 - \text{tr}(S_2^\mu T_2^{1-\mu})}{1-\mu} \geq \frac{1 - \text{tr}(S_1^\mu T_1^{1-\mu})}{1-\mu}$, and by the limit $\mu \rightarrow 1$:

$$D(\omega || \varphi) = \text{tr}(S_2^\mu T_2^{1-\mu})'|_{\mu \rightarrow 1} \geq \text{tr}(S_1^\mu T_1^{1-\mu})'|_{\mu \rightarrow 1} = D(\omega \circ \beta || \varphi \circ \beta) .$$

■

VI. THE QUANTUM DATA PROCESSING INEQUALITY

In this final section we derive the Quantum Data Processing Inequality from Uhlmann's Monotonicity Theorem. We start with a modified formulation of the latter:

Corollary 6.1: Let $\alpha_*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ a physical map of finite quantum systems and $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{A}^+$ physical states. Then:

$$D(\alpha_*(A_1) || \alpha_*(A_2)) \leq D(A_1 || A_2).$$

Proof: This is only a question of notation:

$$\begin{aligned} D(A_1 || A_2) &= D(\text{tr}(A_1 \cdot) || \text{tr}(A_2 \cdot)), \text{ and} \\ D(\alpha_*(A_1) || \alpha_*(A_2)) &= D(\text{tr}(\alpha_*(A_1) \cdot) || \text{tr}(\alpha_*(A_2) \cdot)). \end{aligned}$$

To reduce the claim to Theorem 5.4 notice that $\text{tr}(\alpha_*(A_i) \cdot) = \alpha(\text{tr}(A_i \cdot)) = \text{tr}(A_i \alpha^*(\cdot))$.

■

Definition 6.2: Let $W_*: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ a quantum channel, i.e. a physical map of finite quantum systems. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}^+$ a physical state with $A = \sum_a a |a\rangle\langle a|$ its spectral decomposition, and let $B \triangleq W_*(A)$ the corresponding output (physical) state. Furthermore, let $(A, B) \triangleq \sum_a a |a\rangle\langle a| \otimes W_*(|a\rangle\langle a|)$ the joint state. The *mutual information* is given by

$$I(A; W_*) \triangleq H(A) + H(B) - H(A, B)$$

where $H(X) \triangleq -\text{tr}(X \log X)$ denotes the Shannon-von Neumann entropy.

Here is the Quantum Data Processing Inequality:

Corollary 6.3: Let $W_*: \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ and $D_*: \mathcal{A}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_3$ physical maps of finite quantum systems and $A \in \mathcal{A}_1^+$ a physical state. Then:

$$I(A; D_* \circ W_*) \leq I(A; W_*) .$$

Proof: Because of $I(A; W_*) = D((A, B) \| A \otimes B)$ this is just a consequence of

$$D((\mathbf{1} \otimes D_*)(A, B) \| (\mathbf{1} \otimes D_*)(A \otimes B)) \leq D((A, B) \| A \otimes B) .$$

■

As special case we get *Holevo's Upper Bound* ([6]):

Corollary 6.4: Let $W_*: \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ a quantum channel and D_* a measurement on its output space, i.e. a physical map from $\mathcal{A}_2$ into some commutative C^* -algebra $\mathcal{A}_3$. Then $I(A; D_* \circ W_*) \leq I(A; W_*)$.

We remind the reader that Holevo's result is from 1973 whereas Uhlmann's Monotonicity Theorem is from 1977. Both use analytical considerations for the proofs. There is also an "elementary" proof of Holevo's Upper Bound, using only information theoretical considerations, in [11].

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Andreas Winter for fruitful discussions about quantum information theory.

REFERENCES

- [1] Th. M. Cover, J. A. Thomas, "Elements of Information Theory," Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1991.
- [2] I. Csiszár, J. Körner, "Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems", Academic Press, London, 1981.
- [3] E. B. Davis, "Quantum Theory of Open Systems", Academic Press, London, 1976.
- [4] W. F. Donoghue (Jr.), "Monotone Matrix Functions and Analytic Continuation", Springer, Berlin, 1970.
- [5] F. Hansen, G. K. Pederson, "Jensen's Inequality and Löwner's Theorem", *Math. Ann.*, vol. 258, pp. 229-241, 1982.
- [6] A. S. Holevo, "Bounds for the Quantity of Information Transmitted by a Quantum Communication Channel", *Probl. Peredachi Inform.*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 3-11, 1973. (Engl. transl.: *Probl. of Inf. Transm.*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 177-183, 1973).
- [7] E. H. Lieb, "Convex Trace Functions and the Wigner-Yanase-Dyson Conjecture", *Advan. Math.*, vol. 11, pp. 267-288, 1973.
- [8] M. Ohya, D. Petz, "Quantum Entropy and Its Use", (Texts and Monographs in Physics), Springer, Berlin, 1993.
- [9] W. F. Stinespring, "Positive Functions on C^* -algebras", *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, vol. 6, pp. 211-216, 1955.
- [10] A. Uhlmann, "Relative Entropy and the Wigner-Yanase-Dyson-Lieb Concavity in an Interpolation Theory", *Commun. math. Phys.*, vol. 54, pp. 21-32, 1977.
- [11] A. Winter, "Coding Theorem and Strong Converse for Quantum Channels", to appear in: *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 45, no. 7, 1999.